



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

CORPUS CHRISTI MEDICAL CENTER
c/o HOLLOWAY & GUMBERT
3701 KIRBY DRIVE, SUITE 1288
HOUSTON TX 77098-3926

DWC Claim #:

Injured Employee:

Date of Injury:

Employer Name:

Insurance Carrier #:

Respondent Name

HARTFORD UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-09-2344-01

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

47

MFDR Date Received

NOVEMBER 10, 2008

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated July 15, 2008: "Our client has advised that the above-referenced claim has not been properly paid. Specifically, per Rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ("SLRF") of 75% ... ***Please note that our client is not obligated to furnish Bunch & Associates with implant invoices since the total charges exceed \$40K.***"

Requestor's Position Summary Dated November 7, 2008 "Per Rule § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75% ... it is the position of the Provider that all charges relating to the admission of this claimant are due and payable and not subject to the improper reductions taken by the carrier in this case. The carrier's position is incorrect and in violation of the ACIHFG."

Amount in Dispute: \$42,201.02

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated November 24, 2008: "It is Carrier's position they have correctly reimbursed the provider using the per diem methodology and no additional reimbursement should be made."

Response Submitted by: HARTFORD UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE, 300 S. STATE ST, SYRACUSE, N.Y. 13202

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated SEPTEMBER 8, 2011: "The Requestor submitted charges for a lumbar fusion. Documentation submitted shows that this was uneventful ... At this time, the Respondent continues to uphold its decision that the services provided by the Requestor did not meet the criteria set forth in Rule 134.491 (c) . (6)."

Response Submitted by: HARTFORD UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
December 6, 2007 through December 11, 2007	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$42, 201.02	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 33 *Texas Register* 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits dated December 14, 2007

- 16 – CLM/SRV LACKS INFO WHICH IS NEEDED FOR ADJUDICATION. WE ARE IN RECEIPT OF YOUR BILL FOR SERVICES. PAYMENT OR DENIAL CANNOT BE DETERMINED WITHOUT MEDICAL REPORTS.
- 193 – ORIGINAL PAYMENT DECISION IS BEING MAINTAINED. FINAL ACTION. IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 133.250 (G); "A HEALTH CARE PROVIDER SHALL NOT RESUBMIT A REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER THE CARRIER AHS TAKEN FINAL ACTION ON THE REQUEST.

Explanation of Benefits dated February 15, 2008

- W1 – WORKERS COMP STATE FEE SCHED ADJUST. SUBMITTED SERVICES WERE REPRICED ACCORANCE WITH STATE PER DIEM GUIDELINES.
- W1 – WC STATE FEE SCHED ADJSUT. SUBMITTED SERVICES ARE CONSIDERED INCLUSIVE UNDER THE STATE PER DIEM GUIDELINES.
- W1 - WORKERS COMPENSATION STATE FEE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT, WHEN MEDICALLY NECESSARY. IMPANTABLES & ORTHOTICS AND PROSTHETICS ARE REIMBURSED AT COST TO THE HOSPITAL PLUS 10% PER THE TEXAS ACUTE CARE INPATIENT HOSPITAL FEE GUIDELINES.

Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be

considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$78, 315.25. The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
2. The requestor in its position statement asserts that "Per Rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%." The requestor presumes that it is entitled to the stop loss method of payment because the audited charges exceed \$40,000. As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals in its November 13, 2008 opinion rendered judgment to the contrary. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved...unusually extensive services." The requestor failed to discuss or demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitute unusually extensive services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor did not meet 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6).
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor presumes that because the bill exceeds \$40,000, the stop loss method of payment should apply. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must **demonstrate** that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that constitute unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6).
4. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
 - Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission..." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the length of stay for this admission was four surgical days and one ICU/CCU; therefore the standard per diem amounts of \$1,118.00 and \$1,560.00 apply respectively. The per diem rates multiplied by the allowable days result in a total allowable amount of \$6,032.00.
 - The division notes that 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274)." Review of the requestor's medical bills finds that the following items were billed under revenue code 0278 and are therefore eligible for separate payment under §134.401(c)(4)(A) as follows:

Rev Code	Itemized Statement Description	Cost Invoice Description	UNITS / Cost Per Unit	Total Cost	Cost + 10%
278	Rod 50MM	Bac Fix Spiral Rod, Rigid 5.5mm x 50mm	2 at \$140.00 ea	\$280.00	\$308.00

278	Allograft Back	Graft Mix Deminera	1 at \$956.00 ea	\$956.00	\$1,051.60
278	30CC Bone Chips	Pro Osteon 500R Gran, 30CC, DOM	2 at \$710.00 ea	\$1,420.00	\$1,562.00
278	Surigel	Surigel	1 at \$919.60 ea	\$916.60	\$1,011.56
278	Screw pedical 6.5 X 40	No invoice provided	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
278	Screw pedical 6.5 x 45	No invoice provided	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
278	Spacer Verte 7MM Conve	No invoice provided	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL ALLOWABLE				\$3,933.16	

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$6,032.00 + 3,933.16. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$16,535.42. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

		11/30/12
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

		11/30/12
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a *certificate of service* demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.**

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.